

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,034 to Mundy, et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,794,221 to Egendorf.

Claims 2, 3 7, 11 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,034 to Mundy, et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,794,221 to Egendorf and further in view of U.S. Pat. 6,607,136 to Atsmon, et al.

Claims 4-5, and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,034 to Mundy, et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,529 to Krishan, et al.

Claims 12-13 and 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,034 to Mundy, et al. and U.S. Pat. No. 5,794,221 to Egendorf, and further in view of both U.S. Pat. 6,607,136 to Atsmon, et al. and U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,529 to Krishan, et al.

Paragraph 7 of the Detailed Description of the Invention section has been amended to eliminate the source of the examiner's objection to drawing Figure 2.

The examiner has mischaracterized the Mundy, et al. reference by stating that the Internet service providers bill the end users for the Internet access provided. This is simply not the case. Column 2, lines 58-66 clearly state that the Internet service providers (the wholesalers) bill the intermediary (the Internet service retailer)—not the end users.

The examiner has also mischaracterized the Egendorf reference, which has nothing at all to do with Internet service retailers. Instead, it is a collection system operated by an Internet service provider on behalf of vendors for products and services purchased from the vendor over the Internet by Internet subscribers of the Internet service provider. In essence, the Internet service provider is functioning much like Paypal, but within a sphere that includes only the subscribers of that ISP.

The examiner's rejection of claim 11 is inappropriate, as explained above with regard to the defense of claim 1.

The rejection of claim 7 is also unfounded, as Atsmon, et al. does not disclose an online store managed with software and a database provided by the ISP.

It is believed that the independent claims, as amended, clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art, and are in a condition for allowance. Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

The foregoing is believed to be a full and complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,



Angus C. Fox, III
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 31,828
(801) 225-9000